AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

GEORGE MEANY
President

WM. F. SCHNITZLER
Secretary-Treasurer

JOHN W. LIVINGSTON
Director of Organization

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

NORMAN SMITH, California Director

805 EAST WEBER AVENUE
STOCKTON 3, CALIFORNIA

HOward 6-0384

STATEMENT BEFORE CALIFORNIA SENATE FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE
ON LABOR AND WELFARE, FRESNO, JANUARY 26, 1960

I. Introduction

Through previous hearings, and through investigations in the field, members of the Senate Fact- Finding Committee on Labor and Welfare have gathered information concerning the history and present status of agricultural workers in the State of California. At this, the last of the Committee's hearings on agricultural labor, we should like to focus upon the future for California's farm workers. Recognizing the purposes of the Committee, we shall couch our discussion largely in terms of actions which the State Legislature might take. At certain points in our testimony, however, we shall comment upon developments in other branches and at other levels of government.

II. Looking Backward

We Californians may properly take pride in the fact that, with regard to several important types of farm labor legislation, our State leads most of the rest of the nation.[1] California is one of four states with regulations governing the interstate transportation of farm laborers.[2] Ours is one of four States having laws which expressly apply to farm labor contractors.[3] Only fourteen other States have child-labor laws which apply to agriculture.[4] California is one of ten States with enforceable farm labor housing standards.[5] Only seventeen States, besides California, have election laws which permit migrant farm workers and other absentee voters to register and vote by mail.[6]

1. For a detailed summary of State and Federal farm labor legislation, see Robin Myers, "The Position of Farm Workers in Federal and State Legislation," New York: National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, 1959.
2. The others are Connecticut, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.
3. The others are Oregon, Texas, and Washington.
4. The others are Alaska, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennyslvania, Utah, and Virginia.
5. The others are Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.
6. See Myers, op. cit., p. 26

California is among the fifteen States with wage collection laws which include agricultural workers on an equal basis with other types of workers.[1] And California is one of only three States with workmen's compensation legislation which applies equally to agricultural and non-agricultural employees.[2]

We of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, however, consider it most unsound to conclude from this evidence, as some conclude, that California has done all that may be expected of her, and that she can now afford to wait complacently for the rest of the nation to catch up to her present position.

We believe, both as representatives of agricultural laborers, and as Californians, that our State can do better than this. We believe that every advance toward equity for farm workers in other parts of the country should serve as a spur to us to continue the leadership which California has demostrated in the past. We Californians should never be content with looking backward, congratulating ourselves on all that we have done. Our proper stance is looking forward toward the things which we have not yet done -- but which are within our power of accomplishment.

In the remainder of this paper, we shall discuss two principal types of tasks to which we believe Californians and their elected representatives should look forward. The first, we shall call tasks of implementation: ways in which the intent of existing laws and regulations might better be clarified or carried out. The second, we shall call tasks of construction: the building of needed legislative [illegible] or administrative structures where none exist now.

III. Looking Forward: Implementation

We favor the enforcement of existing farm labor legislation and regulations, as we favor the enforcement of other legal codes and mandates, because such discipline is healthy for the body politic. We are troubled when laws -- those covering farm labor, or any others -- are ignored or flouted, since this brings law as such, and ultimately democracy itself, into disrepute.

In addition, of course, we favor the enforcement of existing farm labor regulations because these regulations serve a most important purpose: to protect a population group which has historically lacked the means to protect itself.

In our opinion, most of the State agencies which are engaged in the enforcement of California's several forms of farm labor legislation are carrying out their duties reasonably conscientiously and effectively. For some years, the Farm Placement Service was an exception to this general statement, but we are encouraged by developments within that agency during the past six months. We should like to go emphatically on record at this time as opposing the efforts of grower interests to divorce the Farm Placement Service from the State Department of Employment. In the first place, this would be inefficient and poor administrative practice. In the second place, it would serve to perpetuate the pernicious myth that farm employment and other types of employment are different in kind. And in the third place, agricultural employers obviously favor such a step only because they have reason to believe they would be able to dominate an "independent" Farm Placement Service in the same manner they dominated it during the twelve years prior to the organizational changes of August 1959.

---

1. The others are Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin.
2. The others are Hawaii and Ohio.

We believe that several of the State agencies are hampered in their efforts to implement farm labor laws, through lack of manpower. This is to say, the appropriations they receive from the State legislature are insufficient to implement fully the laws which the legislature itself has enacted. We are well aware that this is a virtually universal complaint among administrative agencies. We can understand that in the light of certain political and economic realities, may have to develop a thick defensive shell against such complaints. But we should like to place in the record a few facts which we believe put the pleas of farm labor enforcement agencies on a different footing from most.

A.

The Division of Housing, of the State Department of Industrial Relations, reports there are approximately 7,000 labor camps of record in California. (See Table 1). There are probably another 10% which are not "of record." The reason they are unknown is that the Division has too few inspectors to search them out. The implications for inspection of the 7,000 camps which are known to the Division are too obvious to require elaboration. There are only 29 housing inspectors in the Division, and they have many duties besides farm labor camp inspections. They are responsible for checking motel construction, swimming pools, skating rinks, and many other types of public facilities. We believe an increase of 15 men in the inspection staff of the State Division of Housing would be altogether modest and reasonable, and we urge the legislature to appropriate sufficient funds for this increase. (We understand such a proposal was considered by the 1957 legislature, but was defeated at the behest of grower pressure groups.)

B.

The Division of Industrial Safety, another arm of the State Department of Industrial Relations, is responsible for much of the enforcement of the State's farm labor transportation regulations. This Division is confronted with substantially the same problems as the Division of Housing. Its responsibilities for farm labor safety are vast and tremendously scattered geographically. There are probably well over 100,000 trucks and buses in California which are used at one time or another for the transportation of farm workers. And, furthermore, the Division of Industrial Safety has a great many responsibilities in addition to the inspection of farm labor transportation. Here, once again, we consider it little enough to ask that the legislature grant the Division sufficient funds to expand its inspection staff by 50%.

C.

The Division of Labor Law Enforcement is still another agency of the State Division of Industrial Relations which, in our judgment, would give the people of California more than value received if its appropriations were increased. We urge the legislature to consider that there are far more places of employment, and employers, in agriculture than in any other industry, trade, or service in California. (Almost 90,000 farms hire one or more employees.) We urge the legislature to consider, furthermore, that agriculture is unique in its reliance upon a system of labor relations which is peculiarly conducive to wage and related grievances: the labor contractor system. While we appreciate the job which the Division of Labor Law Enforcement is doing with its present facilities, we believe the Division could do an even better job if it were able to strengthen its staffs in heavily agricultural counties.

Table 1

LABOR CAMPS OF RECORD[1] IN EACH COUNTY EMPLOYING MEXICAN NATIONALS, CALIFORNIA, 1957

County	Number of Camps	County	Number of Camps
CALIFORNIA, TOTAL	6,939	Riverside	353
Alameda	83	Sacramento	193
Butte	150	San Benito	41
Colusa	106	San Bernardino	218
Contra Costa	131	San Diego	268
El Dorado	58	San Joaquin	642
Fresno	530	San Luis Obispo	89
Glenn	35	San Mateo	29
Imperial	188	Santa Barbara	117
Kern	326	Santa Clara	367
Kings	96	Santa Cruz	87
Lake	52	Shasta	48
Los Angeles	222	Siskiyou	53
Madera	96	Solano	160
Mendocino	55	Sonoma	148
Merced	154	Stanislaus	139
Monterey	247	Sutter	292
Napa	55	Tehama	31
Nevada	11	Tulare	213
Orange	133	Ventura	165
Placer	200	Yolo	220
		Yuba	67

SOURCE: State of California, Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Housing, personal communication.

1. Known to the State Division of Housing as of September 30, 1957.

D.

We believe, too, that the legislature would do well to look forward to the issuance of an agricultural wage order by the State Industrial Welfare Commission. Such an order, currently under consideration by a board of employer and employee representatives appointed by the Commission, will include regulations affecting wages, hours, and working conditions of women and minors in agriculture. The implementation of the order will require an appreciable expansion of the present staff of the Division of Industrial Welfare. Although we have no way of knowing precisely when the order will be issued, we feel that funds for enforcement should be appropriated soon, to be held by the State Controller on a contingency basis until such time as the order is issued.

E.

We also believe that a strengthening of the Division of Industrial Welfare is called for as a means toward more effective implementation of the State's child-labor laws. Additional funds for the Department of Education, specifically for this purpose, also should be seriously considered. It is a matter of common knowledge that many children under the age of 14 are employed in California agriculture on school days, and even more children under the age of 12 are so employed when school is not in session. Every such case is a violation of the laws of the State.

F.

We urge increased appropriations for the Division of Research and Statistics of the State Department of Employment. One of the greatest weaknesses in the Department's present procedures lies in the estimates which are made periodically concerning farm labor needs and resources. Another very conspicuous weakness consists in the Department's periodic surveys of so-called "prevailing wage rates." At the present time, these statistical exercises are carried out by local offices of the Farm Placement Service, which often fail in their task for one or a combination of the following reasons: (1) local FPS representatives are subject to powerful local pressures, usually from grower interests; (2) these representatives, having many other duties, are not able to spend the time which would be required for careful assessment of farm labor market conditions; and (3) they are almost totally unqualified to carry out a technical operation, such as the drawing of a random sample, construction of a questionnaire, or interviewing of farm labor informants. It is clearly unrealistic to consider placing a technical expert in each of the State's 22 year-around and 53 seasonal farm labor offices. We propose, rather, the creation within the Division of Research and Statistics a corps of ten or twelve competent survey designers and interviewers who will have the full-time duty of studying farm labor needs, supply, wages, and so forth, as rigorously and dispassionately as possible.

G.

In our discussion of State adminsitrative agencies, we may mention, finally, the California Department of Public Health. As the result of labor unions' evidence which could not be ignored, this agency has lately begun to demonstrate interest in the fact that California's 400,000 or more hired farm laborers work under conditions almost totally devoid of the most rudimentary sanitary facilities. There is a good deal of talk about the introduction of farm sanitation bills in the 1961 legislature, and "do-it-yourself" programs in the meantime.

The Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee prepared a research paper on this subject early in September, 1959. We do not have space here to recapitulate the analysis set forth in that paper. Suffice it to say that we still feel as we did then: the disgraceful sanitary conditions in California's number one industry will not be solved by "self-help" projects; nor do they require special legislation for their solution. The problem could be largely solved in a matter of a few months -- if the State Department of Public Health saw fit to enforce seriously certain laws which are already on the statute books. These include Sections 3700, 28287, 28290, 28291, 28295, 28296, 28297, and 28298 of the State Health and Safety Code.

What is needed is, first, determination on the part of the Health Department that existing regulations will be enforced in agriculture, and, second, appropriation of sufficient funds for this purpose. We feel that the most useful single action the California Legislature could take toward cleaning up America's fruit and salad bowls would be the appropriation of additional funds for the Division of Environmental Sanitation of the State Department of Public Health, specifically for the purpose of field sanitation programs.

* * * * * * *

In such ways as these, the administration of existing laws and regulations may be influenced directly by the California legislature. In addition, we should like to mention briefly a way in which the State legislature may perhaps indirectly influence the administration of rules which affect agricultural workers. In January, 1957, the California Assembly and Senate passed concurrent resolutions criticizing the Secretary of Labor for issuing housing standards for Mexican Nationals. These were AR 61, introduced by Assemblyman Geddes (R., Clarement), January 25, 1957; and SR 42, introduced by Senator Murdy (R., Orange County), January 23, 1957. If the legislature of California can seek to influence Federal agencies in a negative and regressive way such as this, we see no reason why it cannot seek to use its influence in useful and progressive ways. We would consider it appropriate, for example, for the State legislature to commend the U.S. Department of Labor for whatever steps it may take toward bringing order into the farm labor market. We would consider it appropriate, for another example, for the legislature to call to the attention of the Secretary of Labor those respects in which his department was administering Public Law 78 laxly in this State -- and to suggest ways in which this law might be administered in closer conformity to its own provisions, and its supposed intent.

Some will say, as a grower witness before the State Senate Fact-Finding Commitee on Labor and Welfare recently said, that such matters are not a proper concern for the State government. The chairman of this committee advanced the shortest and best reply to this point of view: "...we (State legislators) do consider ourselves part of the United States..."

IV. Looking Forward: Construction

A. Minimum Wage

Among the many forms of social legislation from which agricultural laborers are presently excluded, probably none is more widely discussed than minimum wage legislation. The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act presently provides a $1.00 per hour minimum for industries engaged in interstate commerce -- with the exception of agriculture. A number of States have minimum wage laws applying to intrastate commerce, but only two of these State laws include agriculture. Hawaii provides a $1.00 per hour minimum; Alaska a $1.25 per hour minimum.

The California Industrial Welfare Commission is presently considering the issuance of an agricultural wage order which would set minimum acceptable standards for the employment of women and minors in agriculture, including not only minimum wage

Table 5

Financial Experience of Rated Employer Accounts Active on June 30, 1958 with Negative Balance of $100,000 or More as of June 30, 1958, by Industry

Industry Title	Num. of Accts.	Deficit reserve 6-30-57	Deficit reserve 6-30-58	Contributions 7-1-57 to 6-30-58	Charges 7-1-57- 6-30-58	Taxable wages 1957	Def. reserve 6-3-58 as % of '57 Txble wages
Total, all negative reserve accounts	20,081	$154,850,119	$189,091,782	$14,227,247	$48,468,969	$595,002,582	31.8%
Total, selected large accounts	259	118,396,458	133,589,833	4,967,662	20,161,155	189,789,857	70.4
Agricultural services	3	418,636	475,815	6,946	64,126	348,044	136.7
Heavy construction (except highway and marine construction)	5	839,833	1,032,180	105,400	297,751	5,050,817	20.4
Canning; preserving fruits, vegetables, and sea food	89	79,842,771	91,140,816	3,214,491	14,512,644	119,738,287	76.1
Sugar refining (beet)	4	4,135,838	4,656,068	337,755	857,998	12,006,814	38.8
Women's and misses' outerwear	10	2,230,736	2,688,453	111,300	569,019	4,896,882	54.9
Sawmills and planning mills	10	2,520,423	3,025,779	231,816	737,180	9,087,724	33.3
Assemblers of farm products (including fruits and vegetalbes)	99	19,124,224	20,420,711	374,223	1,670,751	14,784,327	138.1
All others	39	9,284,007	10,149,941	585,731	1,451,686	23,876,962	42.5

SOURCE: California Department of Employment, Report 285, #21, January 14, 1960.

provisions, but requirements concerning hours and working conditions. While we support such an action on principle (reserving judgment, of course, on the specific provisions which the wage order may contain), we must point out that women and minors never constituted as much as 20% of the State's hired farm labor force during the years such data were gathered by the Department of Employment, and we are certain this proportion has dwindled drastically in recent years under the impact of the foreign contract labor system.

The question, then, is whether something should be done to protect the earnings of the roughly 90% of the California farm labor force which is made up of males over the age of 18 -- and, if so, what this "something" should be.

We trust we have made it clear throughout this paper that we regard class legislation with the utmost distaste. Accordingly, we would lay down the following premises as basic to any discussion of a State minimum wage law: (a) what is needed is not a farm labor law, but a general labor law; (b) within the framework of such a general law, no industrial distinctions should be drawn. If the State's economy is sufficiently advanced to support, let us say, a minimum of $1.25 per hour for wage-earners, then it is unsound policy to permit restaurant owners, for example, special dispensation to pay $1.10 per hour, laundry owners to pay $1.00, and agricultural employers to pay $.90. In the long run, it is no favor to any industry to allow it to wallow in its own poverty. The State government cannot, of course, ensure by fiat that an industry will become strong and prosperous. By minimum wage legislation, however, the State government can prevent an industry such as agriculture from isolating itself from all that is going on elsewhere in the State's economy. The economy of California is -- or, at least, should be -- essentially indivisible. A minimum wage law is one way to realize this essential unity. The only businessmen who would be hurt by such a law -- and we speak now not only of growers, but restaurateurs, laundry owners, operators of automobile washing establishments, and everyone else -- would be marginal operators who are a drag on the general economy and would serve themselves and society-at-large better if they were engaged in some other sort of business.

By "marginal operator" we do not refer to the small, family-type farmer who is admittedly in serious straits under present conditions. We refer to the farmer in name only who has entered this particular industry because he thought he could make a quick "killing," and whose operation is built upon a cheap, captive labor supply. We know of many such instances in San Joaquin County, for example. Persons who knew next to nothing about growing tomatoes leased a few hundred acres of land, telephoned the local Association for Mexican Nationals to plant, cultivate, and pick tomatoes at wages fixed by the Association itself, and sat back to wait for the money to roll in. In most cases, the money did not roll in. Synthetic farmers do not know enough about their business to get optimum quantity or quality. And, even more clearly, such speculators have created conditions of grievous overproduction which has, of course, pulled down the prices which legitimate farmers receive.

The truth of the matter is, the family farmer, although he is sometimes called "marginal," actually stands poles apart from the marginal operator about whom we are speaking here. The truly marginal operator stays in business only because he receives what amounts to a subsidy of cheap, tractable foreign labor from the government. There is no doubt whatever in our minds that these types of marginal tomato growers have been paying their braceros piece rates which yielded an average hourly equivalent of not more than 60¢. If such growers were required to pay, say, $1.25 per hour, or a piece rate equivalent, their shortcomings as businessmen would no longer be supportable, and they would have to abandon the growing of tomatoes. To this development we would say: good riddance.

The bona fide farmer, on the other hand, stands to gain every bit as much from a minimum wage law as hired laborers themselves. His operation, rather than resting upon a cheap labor supply delivered by the State and Federal governments, rests upon the

labof which he himself, and the other members of family, perform. If his labor is devalued, his situation becomes precarious -- or, as the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Farm Bureau would have it -- "marginal." What determines the value of his labor? The most obvious answer, no doubt, is, "The price he receives for his product." Many observers, we fear, are unwilling or unable to push beyond this superficial reply. More penetrating follow-up questions should be asked. What determines the price he receives for his product? Preeminently, the prices which his larger competitors receive for theirs. What determines the price they receive for their commodities? First among many factors would appear to be the costs which go into the production of those commodities. What are those costs? The largest of them is the cost of hired labor.

There is no arguing away the inexorable logic of this analysis: the position of the working farmer and his family is dependent, above all else, upon the position of farm laborers who work for wages. If the working farmer is in unhappy straits today (and we do not doubt that he is), it is in the last analysis for the very same reasons that the hired farm worker is in unhappy straits. If rural representatives in the State of California are as concerned for the welfare of the family farmer as they claim to be, we can think of no better way they could serve this concern than through the enactment of a meaningful State minimum wage law.

We will withhold comment at this time upon the level at which a floor under wages might be constructed. We are content to observe that the higher the floor, the greater the benefit will be not only to California's Hired farm workers, but to California's legitimate farm operators.

B. Civil Rights

Agricultural employers who maintain their own labor camps are at the present time singled out as the only employers in the State of California who are entitled to discriminate against workers on the basis of race, national origin, and other irrelevancies.

Among the many curiosities which flourish in the contemporary farm labor market, we find this among the most curious. A brief historical review will help to explain our puzzlement. In April, 1957, Patrick Hillings, former Congressman from California's 25th District, conducted a series of hearings on the importation of Japanese Nationals to work in California agriculture under three year contracts.

The specific question at issue was, "Should the way be opened for importation beyond the ceiling of 1,000 Japanese Nationals already approved by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and by the Department of Labor?" Congressman Hillings decided this question in the affirmative, but that is beside the point of the present discussion. Of particular interest here is the fact that Mr. Hillings asked grower after grower if there were any racial tensions in California agriculture which might be aggravated by the expanded importation of Japanese Nationals. Every grower witness denied categorically that there were any racial problems in California's farm labor force. The following interchanges are representative of things which were said at the Hillings Subcommittee hearing in Los Angeles, April 30, 1957.

Mr. HILLINGS: Have you seen any evidence of racial prejudice or discrimination in connection with either the Mexican or Japanese program?

Mr. MILLER (Manager, Agricultural Producers Labor Committee): No, sir. Absolutely none.

Mr. HILLINGS: Have you heard any grievances or complaints about the Japanese program?

Mr. MILLER: I want to assure you, Congressman, that I have tried diligently to find them. But I have found none.

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. MASAOKA (Washington, D.C., Representative, Japanese-American Citizens League). ... We are well aware that there used to be talk about the "yellow" menace," and so forth, but we Japanese-Americans know this is a thing of the past. We are watching the foreign labor program closely. If there had been any racial incidents, we would have heard about them. But there has been nothing whatever of that kind... We see this as a great program of international exchange. Thousands of American GI's have seen Japan in the past twelve years. Now visiting farmers from Japan are seeing the United States. This is one of the greatest programs of democracy in action I have ever heard of. It is a great bulwark against communism... Let us not discriminate against workers from Japan in favor of braceros from Mexico.

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. HILLINGS: Would you identify yourself, please?

Mr. HEIL: I am Robert Heil, representing the Orange County Vegetable Growers Association, Santa Ana, California.

Mr. HILLINGS: What is that association?

Mr. HEIL: It is strictly a Mexican and Japanese contracting association. We serve members in Los Angeles, Riverside, and Orange Counties...

Mr. HILLINGS: Do you have any problems? How do your Japanese and Mexican workers get along together?

Mr. HEIL: We have no problems. At the present time, we have 125 Japanese workers. Some of them work in the same crews as Mexican Nationals. There is no conflict. We could use three times as many Japaneses without any trouble... This Japanese program has many advantages. It teaches the workers better methods of farming. It teaches them the American way of life... I object to the use of the term "captive labor gangs." These people came here voluntarily. They're free to move about when they're not working... They and the Mexican workers are of better moral quality than many of our own workers.

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. HILLINGS: Have you encountered any racial problems, or other problems, in connection with this Japanese program?

Mr. HOVLEY (Manager, Oxnard Plains Labor Association). No, I have not. As a matter of fact, there is a feeling of comradeship, of sympathy, and friendliness within the program that is wonderful to behold. I mean, between the workers themselves, and between the workers and the growers.

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. HILLINGS: Has any race prejudice arisen in the use of Japanese labor?

Mr. HAYES (Chief, California Farm Placement Service). No, sir. To be very honest with you, we feared that there might be racial tension, because of things that happened back in history -- in the history of Japanese labor in California. But I am happy to say that our fears have proved to be completely unfounded. We don't know of a single instance in which there have been unhappy racial feelings.

Mr. HILLINGS: How do the Japanese get along with the Mexican braceros?

Mr. HAYES: Most of the foremen of the Japanese crews are of Mexican ancestry, and the foremen and their crews get along fine together.

Mr. HILLINGS: How about Filipinos? One might expect there would be hard feelings on the part of the local Filipinos toward the Japanese, in view of what happened during World War II.

Mr. HAYES: Apparently that is all a thing of the past. There is no trouble whatever.

Mr. HILLINGS: Do these foreign workers mingle with the community at all

Mr. HAYES: They're free men.

Mr. HILLINGS: I just want to say that I am impressed by the lack of racial tension we have here in California agriculture. We are a good example, I think, of what could be done elsewhere...

Other grower witnesses who appeared in the course of these hearings unanimously testified to the good will which was said to reign among men in California fields and orchards. Two years later a different legislative body conducted hearings with quite a different purpose: to consider a Fair Employment Practices Act for California. At this time, spokesmen for California's agricultural employers directly contradicted the things they had said during the Hillings Subcommittee hearings. Grower witnesses testified, in effect, that the several ethnic groups employed in California agriculture were at one another's throats, and the only way to protect them from each other was to segregate them. Grower representatives asked for blanket exemption from fair employment practices legislation and settled for exemption of all farm workers who are housed at the place of their employment.

This was an astonishingly cynical demonstration. The truth, of course, is that farm workers in this State are far too preoccupied trying to stay alive to expend their energy in interracial conflict. One is tempted to conclude that growers sought exclusion from the Fair Employemtn Practices Act merely to maintain their record of obtaining virtually every exclusion they have demanded of the State legislature. The stake involved had little to do with the "right" of growers to practice racial discrimination in hiring. The stake at issue was growers' "right" to continue to ~~be regarded~~ as different in kind from other employers of labor.

The California legislature should move swiftly and decisively to correct both of these two types of misapprehensions. Growers do not have the right to practice social discrimination in employment. And, even more basically, growers are not different in kind from other classes of employers.

The 1959 session of the California legislature considered another piece of legislation having to do with the civil rights of California workers -- including farm workers. A.B. 419 would have granted workers engaged in intrastate commerce essentially the same sorts of protections currently granted other workers by the Federal Labor-Management Relations Act. But with this difference: A.B. 419 did not exclude farm laborers; the Taft-Hartley Act does.

As every Californian interested in social legislation knows, A.B. 419 was killed in committee in the State Senate, with scarcely a good word said on its behalf. We of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee hold no brief for the various provisions of that particular piece of draft legislation. But we do insist on the right of individuals to associate and organize in their own interest. Every level of government should be deeply committed to the protection of this right. The State of California is not, we fear, so committed at the present time, at least insofar as this right applies to agricultural workers. Given a virtual vacuum within which to operate, local government has shown itself to be not only indifferent to the fundamental rights of farm laborers, but on occasion actively engaged in denying these rights.[1]

The legislature of the State of California should move to fill this vacuum -- and to fill it in the direction of strengthening rather than eroding civil rights. By the time the 1961 legislature convenes, we expect to be in a position to move beyond this general statement of principle to advocacy of specific legislation on this point.

We might say at this time, however, that we are not speaking of class legislation any more than we were in our discussion of a minimum wage. Farm laborers should enjoy the same rights -- no more, and no less -- as other laborers, and, indeed, all citizens, whether they are members of the laboring class or not. We are sympathetic, for example, to the intent of a draft bill introduced in the spring of 1959, by State Senator Montgomery. This bill would have removed certain restraints presently placed on independent agricultural producers who attempt to organize on their own behalf. We of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee have said repeatedly that we not only recognize the right of growers to band together for legitimate purposes -- we encourage their exercise of this right, as part of the necessary cure for the basic sickness of agriculture. But justice must be even-handed. Growers cannot reasonably expect the State of California to guarantee their right to organize, while failing to safeguard the right of farm workers to organize. We hope the legislature will shortly consolidate both of these rights, which are not, in fact, two fights, but one.

C. Federal Legislation

We have already discussed the possibilities for the State legislature to influence the activities of Federal executive agencies. The possibilities are even greater for the legislature of California to bring its collective will to the attention of the law-making branch of the Federal government. Following are some of the issues on which either or both houses of the legislature might well memorialize the U.S. Congress.

(1) Wage and Hour Legislation.

Some friends of farm labor feel that any Federal legislation covering agricultural labor is better than none, and are therefore prepared to support a Federal minimum wage of $.75 per hour for farm workers. It is our understanding that bills of this nature will be introduced during the present Congressional session. If the legislature of California sees fit to express itself on the issue of a Federal minimum wage for agriculture, we hope it will do so in terms of parity for farm workers. The minimum wage covering other industries was not watered down for the benefit of Southern textile operators, for example, who were paying only 50¢ an hour. We see no reason why an agricultural minimum wage should be watered down because Southern growers are doing the same thing.

---

1. For copious documentation of this point, see Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. Senate, 76th Congress, 2nd Session, pursuant to S.R. 266, Washington, D.C., 1940. See particularly volumes 50, 51, 54, 55, and 74.

(2) Housing.

On January 7, 1960, Assemblyman Gordon H. Winton (D-Merced) was quoted in the press as saying the key to the "solution of (the) farm worker shortage lies in housing." A number of proposals have been made to facilitate the construction of new farm labor housing. It is likely that bills will be introduced in the U.S. Congress this year to provide low-interest loans for this purpose, and to permit accelerated tax write-offs of these expenditures. While we appreciate the good intentions of those w o espouse such measures, and while we agree that farm labor housing generally leaves much to be desired, we fear we cannot agree that housing is the "key" to the farm labor problem.

Let us assume for a moment that American coal miners were paid $.70 to $1.00 per hour, lived in company towns, bought supplies at company stores, were discouraged by armed deputies from organizing, were excluded from child labor laws and other social legislation, and were forced to compete with indentured laborers from Poland and Bulgaria. If someone were to ask us, "How are we ever going to attract and retain domestic coal miners?", we would say, "Get rid of child labor, get rid of foreign contract labor, let the domestics organize and bargain for a living wage." If someone said, "What about the terrible housing?", we would say, "Do these other things, and the housing will take care of itself."

In other words, the goal to be sought is not more and better paternalism, as reflected, for example, in more and better farm labor camps. The goal to be sought is a labor force of free men, sufficiently well paid that they can provide their own "perquisites" -- housing, food, transportation -- as commuters to jobs in other industries do.

We will certainly not opppse any efforts to improve farm labor housing through the types of legislation mentioned above. But we hope that the attention of legislators and the general citizenry will not become diverted by these palliative measures from the more fundamental tasks which remain to be done.

(3) Social Security.

A grower-sponsored amendment to the Social Security Act in 1956 further restricted the restricted coverage of farm workers by the Act, which had been voted for the first time in 1955. The requirement that farm workers earn at least $150 from a single employer during a year, or work at least 20 days at hourly rates, for a single employer, eliminates many if not most seasonal agricultural laborers from coverage by this form of social legislation. We ask that the California legislature memorialize the U.S. Congress to extend full Social Security coverage to the persons in our society who need it most. We ask, also, that the legislature memorialize the Federal government to take action against two commonplace evasions of the Social Security Act: deductions by employers (usually farm labor contractors) which are never credited to the employee's account or returned to him; and agreements between employers, contractors, and/or farm workers, whereby OASI deductions are never made at all.

(4) Crew Leader Registration.

Laws were introduced in the 85th Congress which would have controlled the activities of farm labor crew leaders operating across State boundaries. We understand that these bills were directed particularly at contractors who haul domestic migrants from Florida up the Atlantic Seaboard and those who haul Texas farm workers through a fan-shaped area of the Middle West. Similar legislation will be introduced this year, and we imagine its chances of passage are relatively good.

We have no objection to the purposes of the legislation. We do not doubt that there are many rapacious and irresponsible farm labor contractors operating across State lines. These contractors should be curbed. But in this case, once again,

we hope that the friends of farm labor will not confuse this issue with the more important issues at stake. The overriding problem facing migratory farm workers is not crew leaders who cheat them of part of their wages, but a way of life which cheats them of part of their humanity. The substitution of honest crew leaders for dishonest crew leaders will leave untouched, for example, the fact that migrants only find work one day out of every three, and the fact that they have no roots in the soil of the larger society.

(5) Labor-Management Relations Legislation.

As we have said, agriculture is the only industry which is excluded from the Taft-Hartley Act, as it was the only industry excluded from the Wagner Act which preceded the Taft-Hartley Act. We know of no plans in Congress to remove this exclusion. This is not to say, however, that it would be inappropriate for the California legislature to memorialize Congress on the matter. If the States were required to wait silently for Congressional leadership on every issue, social progress in the United States would have been very much slower than it has been. In fact, the U.S. Constitution presupposes that leadership will in many instances come from State legislatures, since this is one of the two means provided for amendment of the Constitution.

(6) Child Labor.

Application of Federal child labor laws (part of the Fair Labor Standards Act) to agriculture should be tied to other farm labor reforms. To eliminate minors from agriculture, without at the same time improving wages and employment security, would work a grave hardship on many farm labor families, and would very likely accelerate the present exodus of domestics from the farm labor market.

We hope we are not misunderstood. We deplore the exploitation of children on the industrialized farms of California and the nation. But child labor reforms, like a number of other reforms we have already discussed, will by themselves solve nothing. Child labor reforms must be approached as part of an interdependent network of reforms which, taken together, will remold agriculture in ways long ago taken for granted in every other sector of the American economy.

(7) Foreign Contract Labor.

We are already clearly on the record regarding the bracero program and other alien contract labor systems.

(a) Public Law 78 should be expunged from the books;

(b) Immigration laws should be rewritten to prevent future repetitions of this economic disaster and moral disgrace;

(c) The McCarran-Walter Act should be rewritten to facilitate legitimate imigration;

(d) Congress should provide for a massive program of technical assistance to our immediate neighbor to the South. Braceros' earnings of approximately $50,000,000 per year have done virtually nothing to eliminate the desperate poverty of rural Mexico. A technical assistance program ten times as great would be a modest beginning.

We urge the California legislature to memorialize Congress on each of these four related points.

(8) The Farm Program.

In the political lexicon of today, "farm legislation" means only one thing: legislation to help the farmer, not the farm worker. Speaking by and large, we are

inclined to believe the major troubles of the country's farmers are attributable to the fact they have been overprotected rather than underprotected. If the U.S. Congress really wants to help farmers who need help, it can do no better than eliminate the factors, discussed above, which have devalued the small farmer's labor. The various subsidy programs, which have not been helping the small farmer anyway, would then be superfluous. We would, however, support school lunch programs, "food for peace," and other plans which have a useful social purposes beyond the mere placing of crutches under farm income.

D. Unemployment Insurance

We have reserved until last a form of social legislation about which we would like to comment in special detail. We propose to discuss unemployment insurance at some length because (1) the insecurity of farm workers' employment is perhaps an even more pronounced disability than their low wages while they are working; (2) more statistical evidence is available, bearing on the question of umemployment insurance for farm workers, than is available for perhaps any of the other forms of social legislation we have discussed; (3) whereas the legislature of California can only recommend in many of the areas we have reviewed, it has unchallenged authority over the provisions of the State's unemployment insurance program. We believe it is politically realistic to begin planning seriously now for the extension of unemployment insurance to farm workers at the next regular session of the California legislature.

California was the fifth State in the Union to pass an Unemployment Insurance Act, doing so in 1935, prior to the passage of the Federal Social Security Act which facilitated this type of social legislation by the States. However, there are some important respects in which California's present Unemployement Insurance Act is less "liberal" than such laws in other States. For example, 44 States have less stringent requirements than California as regards the minimum earnings which confer eligibility for unemployment insurance. (California's minimum: $600.)

Of even greater concern to us is the fact that California presently excludes several major classes of workers from this vital form of social legislation. In October, 1959, there were 855,500 civilian employees of various levels of government in California, including school districts. These employees were excluded from the unemployment insurance act. Perhaps 150,000 persons worked as domestics in private households at some time during the year. They were excluded from unemployment insurance coverage. An estimated 75,000 persons were employed by nonprofit institutions, such as churches. Such employees are exempted from unemployment insurance. And, of particular interest to the present discussion, more than half a million individuals worked for wages in California agriculture at one time or another during 1959. Farm employment is excluded from the State Unemployment Insurance Act's definition of "employment."

We should like to emphasize the fact that agriculture, alone among these major types of exemptions,[1] is an industry, which in common with all industries, operates for profit. Why, then, is the agricultural industry excluded? It would appear that the principal reasons for continued exclusion of farm laborers from the State Unemployment Insurance Act are some combination of the following: (1) Alleged administrative obstacles; (2) alleged actuarial obstacles; (3) the sheer weight of tradition. Let us examine each of these three explanations.

1. Other, numerically smaller, exemptions include the following: business opportunity brokers and salesmen; student employees of schools and colleges; caddies; election campaign workers; race horse exercise boy; hospital interns; news vendors; cemetery brokers and salesmen; student nurses; real estate salesman and brokers; free-lance jockeys; college club and fraternity employees; and baseball players.

(1) The administrative problems entailed in the extension of unemployment insurance to farm workers are admittedly formidable. In the present disorganized state of the farm labor market, many agricultural employers have only the vaguest notion how many persons worked for them during a given period, who they were, where they came from, where they went, or how much they earned. Similarly, many agricultural workers have only the vaguest notion whom they worked for in a given season, or how much they earned. It will be necessary to create new systems of record-keeping, among both agricultural employers and employees, if an unemployment insurance system is to be successful. Before this can be done, it will be necessary to create respect for records as such. We of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee believe we can be of very great assistance to the government agencies concerned, in carrying out such programs of orientation among farm laborers.

Formidable as the administrative problems may be, we are certain they are not insoluble. For one thing, we would point to the lessons which the Mexican National program teaches. Although this program has had many deeply damaging effects, it has proved useful in one respect: it has demonstrated beyond cavil that agricultural employers can, if they wish, maintain adquate records of employees, hours, gross earnings, deductions, and other pertinent information. We would point, secondly, to a report prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security in 1951, even before the bracero program had conclusively demonstrated the feasibility of farm labor record-keeping. After reviewing in detail the many administrative problems of covering agriculture, Bureau of Employment Security analysts concluded that administrative procedures could be developed to meet each difficulty.[1]

It may come as a surprise to many persons to learn that an employer who falls within an excluded category is entitled to elective coverage if he wishes it. It may come as an additional surprise to many persons to learn that 688 commercial farms in California were covered by unemployment insurance on this basis, as of December 8, 1959. Of these, 499 had been covered sufficiently long to build up an experience rating. The contributions of these rated agricultural employers, in terms of percentage of taxable payroll, were as follows:

Table 2

Rate	Number of Employers
0.3%	51
0.4	13
0.5	9
0.6	10
0.7	14
0.8	43
0.9	37
1.0	44
1.3	22
1.5	17
1.8	22
2.0	10
2.3	17
2.5	20
2.7	120

SOURCE: California Department of Employment, "Unemployment Insurance Experience Rating Factors, Rate Year 1959," Sacramento, December 8, 1959, pp. 2-3.

1. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Extension of Unemployment Insurance Coverage to Farm Labor, Washington, D.C., 1951.

The median contribution of these agricultural employers was 1.3% of taxable payroll, which, interestingly enough, was precisely the median contribution of all covered employers in the State in 1957.

Now, it may be assumed that the 688 commercial farms which have elected to participate in the unemployment insurance program are, for the most part, dairy, poultry, or other types of farms which typically offer much stabler employment than the average fruit or vegetable farm. Nonetheless, these 688 farms teach us a valuable lesson: there is nothing intrinsic to agriculture per se which precludes the creation of administrative methods suited to unemployment insurance coverage.

(2) The casual observer is perhaps prone to assume that most agricultural labor is inherently so highly seasonal as to make the entire concept of unemployment insurance inapplicable, on actuarial grounds. Let us examine this assumption with some care.

The truth is that California agriculture, taken as a whole, is less seasonal than a number of industries which have been covered by the State's Unemployment Insurance Act since its very inception. In 1959, the number of hired farm workers at the year's peak in September was 408,660: the number at the year's low point in March was 230,140. Expressed in terms of index numbers, based on the year's average, farm employment varied from a low of 72 to a high of 128. These index numbers may be compared, for example, with the following from other industries:

Table 3

Industry and Area	High Employment Index	Low Employment Index
Pine logging and sawmills, State	132	48
Sacramento Valley and adjacent mountains	128	65
San Joaquin Valley and adjacent mountains	139	69
Dried fruit packing, State	NA	NA
San Joaquin Valley	195	56
Central Coast area	154	51
San Francisco Bay area	240	74
Fish canning, State	NA	NA
Los Angeles area	125	40
San Diego area	134	23
Monterey area	253	39
San Francisco Bay area	350	49
Fruit & vegetable canning, State	141	49
Sacramento Valley	334	31
San Joaquin Valley	353	25
San Francisco Bay area	252	38
Central Coast area	282	41
Contract sorting, grading, and packing of citrus fruits	190	44
Contract sorting, grading, and packing of noncitrus fruits and vegetables	162	49
Street and highway construction	126	74
Wholesale trade: farm products	131	70
Trailer parks and camps	141	58

SOURCES: State figures: California Department of Employment, "California Employment and Payrolls," 1958 editions. Area figures: California Department of Employment, "Seasonal Workers in California," Bulletin No. 21, April, 1947, pp. 17a, 23a, 25a, and 29a.
NA: Not Available.

In the recent past, workers in highly seasonal industries such as these have received unemployment insurance benefit payments far above the State average. In 1957, for example, total benefits from the unemployment insurance fund averaged 1.3% of taxable payrolls in the State. This figure may be compared with the following figures from certain selected industries in that year.

Table 4

Industry	Benefit Payments as Percentage of Taxable Wages
Contract packing of fruits and vegetables, except citrus	8.3
Contract packing of citrus fruits	11.0
Fishing	6.8
Logging camps and logging contractors	10.2
Canning and preserving seafoods	6.8
Canning and preserving fruits and vegetables	11.2
Assemblers of fruits and vegetables, except citrus	9.5
Assemblers of citrus fruits	7.3

SOURCE: California Department of Employment, Reprot 352, #13. August 28, 1958.

These high benefit rates are not the aberrations of a single year or season. Table 5/reveals that certain industries tend consistently to draw far more from the State Unemployment Insurance Fund than they contribute to it.

(next page)

We do not mean to suggest by these types of data that highly seasonal industries, such as garment making, sugar beet refining, and construction, should be removed from the Unemployment Insurance Act, or should be penalized in any other way. Quite the contrary. We have presented this type of evidence to illustrate a fundamental insurance principle: some carriers have different experience records from others, no matter what type of insurance is involved. The entire point of having insurance, particularly social insurance, is to spread risks and costs over as broad a base as possible in order that unusual experience records may be absorbed with relatively little hardship to any one group.

If this principle has been accepted with respect to industries as seasonal as those we have been discussing, we see no actuarial justification for the continued exclusion of agriculture.

To date, there has been only one serious effort to calculate the costs of extending unemployment insurance to California's agricultural wrkers. In October, 1952, the Division of Research and Statistics of the State Department of Employment completed a study based on the work histories and earnings of 5,909 California farm laborers. The Division estimated that if farm workers had been covered by the Unemployment Insurance Act at that time, they would have been eligible for benefits

totalling 15.23% of taxable agricultural wages. The Division estimated that by the year 1960, benefits payable to farm workers would have dropped below 12% of taxable wages, through "anticipated trends toward a better organized agricultural labor force and toward increased mechanization of agriculture."[1]

It is extremely important to note that at the time this study was made, California's Unemployment Insurance Act required only $300 in earnings during a "base period" in order for a claimant to gain eligibility. On this basis, 65.2% of the State's hired farm workers would have been eligible for unemployment insurance, assuming they were able to meet other requirements. Since 1953, however, the Act has been amended to require $600 in covered earnings, for eligibility. If this test had been applied at the time the Department of Employment conducted its study, only 50.5% of the State's farm workers would have been eligible.

The Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee has prepared several analyses which suggest that, for most seasonal farm workers, wages have not increased appreciably during the past eight years. It appears, then, that only about half of the State's agricultural laborers would be covered by unemployment insurance even if the Act were extended to them in its present form.

The question remains, of course, "How much will it cost, and who will pay?" Farm wages in California currently total about $440,000,000 per year. Assuming that, at the outset, the Department of Employment's estimates of several years ago still hold good, theoretical unemployment insurance benefits for farm laborers would approximate $63,000,000 a year. The experience of other industries demonstrates that only a minority of workers technically eligible for unemployment insurance benefits actually file claims for such benefits. For example, a Department of Employment survey of canning, dried fruit packing, and lumbering industries found only 26% to 33% of the male employees entitled to unemployment insurance payments during the preceding year had drawn any benefits. These are industries which have been covered for many years; employees are presumable relatively familiar with the benefits to which they are entitled. Agricultural workers, being unfamiliar with the niceties of unemployment insurance and other social legislation, might reasonably be expected to avail themselves of their benefits even less frequently. But, in order to place our estimates on the conservative side, let us assume that 50% of the payable benefits under unemployment insurance program for agriculture were actually paid. The total cost, given the other conditions we have already outlined, would be approximately $27,000,000, or 6% of taxable farm wages. This percentage is less than that already experienced by other seasonal industries in the State.

Broadly speaking, there are two ways in which the bill could be paid. It might be paid as the bill for the canning industry, for example, is now being paid: through what amounts to a subsidy from less seasonal industries. Under the present legal ceiling of 3.0% of taxable payroll, agriculture would pay between one-third and one-half the cost of providing its employees with unemployment insurance. There are several ways in which the remainder could be raised without impairing the solvency of the unemployment insurance fund. . For example, if the taxable wage base were raised from $3,600 to, say, $4,000, this alone would increase the revenue of the unemployment insurance fund by more than enough to cover the increased costs of agricultural coverage. Alternatively, it would be possible to revise the experience rating system, which at present permits employers with particularly favorable employment experiences to pay as little as 0.3% of payroll into the fund.

The second principal approach to financing would be for agricultural employers and employees to support the farm labor program by themselves. We see certain theoretical advantages to such a procedure. If California growers were required to pay 6% of payroll for the privilege of maintaining a chaotic labor

1. California Department of Employment, A Sourcebook on Unemployment Insurance in California. Sacramento, September 28, 1953, p. 84. The Department of Employment has issued subsequent estimates of the costs of agricultural coverage, but all have been based on the original data gathered in the 1952 study.

market, we believe they would show a quickened interest in stabilizing the employment which they offer. They would diversify their crops, stagger their plantings, develop strains with longer harvest periods, work out intrastate "annual worker plans," and do a number of other sensible things which farm worker representatives have been advocating for many years. Such steps could well reduce agricultural employers' contributions to a self-supporting unemployment insurance fund to levels comparable to those of other major industries.

At the same time, we see significant theoretical disadvantages to setting up a distinct unemployment insurance plan for farm workers. As we have said elsewhere in this paper, we believe the goal to be sought is the elimination of arbitrary and hurtful distinctions between agriculture and other industries. A "do-it-yourself" unemployment insurance program for agriculture would serve to perpetuate the impression that farm employment is somehow different from any other type of employment, and for this reason, if for no other, we favor a simple extension of the present "pool" arrangement to agriculture.

We have discussed both the alleged administrative obstacles and alleged fiscal obstacles to coverage of farm workers by unemployment insurance. Neither of these difficulties is nearly so formidable as the farm lobby would like us to believe. The only remaining argument for continued exclusion of farm labor is that "it has always been done." Conservatives will no doubt rely heavily upon the dead hand of tradition in their attempts to prevent significant amendment of the Unemployment Insurance Act during the 1961 legislative session. We trust that this sort of argument, which is really no argument at all, will crumble under the weight of sociological and economic evidence, and under the weight of the collective conscience of the people of California.

V. Summary and Conclusions

Farm labor, it is often said, is a complex matter. We have attempted to deal with some of these complexities in the present paper, but do not pretend to have taken up every issue in the field, or traced every argument on those issues we have taken up. If the legislature of the State of California waits until it has perfect understanding of the farm labor situation before it acts, it will never act at all.

We should like to suggest that the farm labor problem, while admittedly complex from one point of view, is, from an equally valid point of view, very simple. The entire problem may be reduced to a single thread, which runs throughout all that we have said in this testimony. This thread may be summarized in the following way: it should be public policy, in California and in the nation, to bring an end, as expeditiously as possible, to double standards in the structure of our economy. There is no place in the United States of America for a caste system; there is no place for second-class citizenship; no place for unequal protection of the law; no place for the disinheritance of any group. But each of these conditions may be found in the industry of agriculture. Farm laborers do not enjoy equality under the law; they are, in effect, an untouchable caste; they labor under a set of standards which are different from, and inferior to, those under which other industrial workers labor; they are among the disinherited of our society -- stripped of the heritage of material blessings and larger values, which our society confers generally upon its communicants. By larger values, we mean such things as the assumption that a man shall enjoy effective control over his own destiny, and the assumption that a man is fully worthy of esteem and honor unless his individual actions conclusively demonstrate otherwise. Farm laborers have been robbed of dignity and respect, not because of anything they have or have not done, but because of their employment in an occupation which society-at-large has "exempted" from the standards which confer dignity and respect.

Government cannot guarantee that a man shall respect another man, or that a man shall respect himself. But government can influence the conditions which in turn influence the relationships between men. Government can ameliorate situations which systematically destroy human dignity. Government can help to build situations which are conducive to the flowering of a sense of human worth. We should say these sorts of activities are not only a proper function of government -- they are the most important function of government. When the members of a society esteem one another and themselves, that society endures; otherwise, it fails.

Early in our discussion, we conceded that, in some respects, the lot of the average farm laborer in California is happier than that of the average farm laborer in certain other parts of the country. But that is beside the point. When we say there should be a single standard for workers in our society, we mean that that standard should be the best of which America is capable, not the worst, and not some compromise between the best and the worst.

We therefore reject the attitude that we Californians can afford to be complacent because our State has a labor camp code while others do not; because our State has transportation regulations which others do not; or because our State has compulsory workmen's compensation legislation which some others cannot match.

There is much that California still might do to reduce the inequities under which its farm workers live and labor. We regard these uncompleted tasks, not as vexations, but as opportunities for constructive accomplishment. Opportunities lie before us to bring justice to 400,000 of our wage-earners for whom justice has not yet fully matured. This in itself will be an accomplishment of a lofty order. But, even beyond the good we may do for our own citizenry, is the good we may do at least indirectly, for the disinherited beyond our State borders.

The Senate and Assembly of California, working with other bodies, public and private, may raise a standard which will prove to all who have eyes to see that agriculture need not continue to remain outside the mainstream of America's economic, social, and moral order. The importance of this truth to our State and to our country as a whole cannot be exaggerated. The demonstration of this truth is as noble as any service which lies within the power of the legislature of California to perform.

AWOC Research Paper #15
HPA:MLR
January 23, 1960.